



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/561,907

06/09/2006

Takao Yashiro

4662-115

1501

23117 7590 06/19/2007

NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER

WALKE, AMANDA C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1752

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/19/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/561,907

Applicant(s)

YASHIRO ET AL.

Examiner

Amanda C. Walke

Art Unit

1752

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 7-11 are objected to because of the following informalities: In line 1 of claims 7, 8, 10, and line 3 of claim 9, "anyone" should be "any one". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 10 provides for the use of a composition, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 1752

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamura et al (EP 938026).

Yamamura et al disclose a photocurable composition comprising:

- (A) a cationically polymerizable organic compound;[0025]
- (B) a cationic photopolymerization initiator;
- (C) an ethylenically unsaturated monomer;
- (D) a radical photopolymerization initiator; and
- (E) a polyol
- (F) elastomeric particles having a diameter of 10-700nm.

In amounts of :

20-85 wt% component (A), 0.1-10 wt% component (B), 5-45 wt% component (C), 0.1-8 wt% component (D), and 5-35 wt% component (E).

The reference teaches that component C may be either a mono or poly functional monomer having a molecular weight of 110-2,000 ([0038]-[0047]). Among polyfunctional monomers listed are:

ethylene glycol di(meth)acrylate, dicyclopentenyl di(meth)acrylate, triethylene glycol diacrylate, tetraethylene glycol di(meth)acrylate, tricyclodecanediyl dimethylene di(meth)acrylate, tris(2-hydroxyethyl)isocyanurate di(meth)acrylate, tris(2-hydroxyethyl)isocyanurate tri(meth)acrylate, caprolactone-modified tris(2-hydroxyethyl)isocyanurate tri(meth)acrylate, pentaerythritol tri(meth)acrylate, pentaerythritol tetra(meth)acrylate, polyester di(meth)acrylate, poly-ethylene glycol di(meth)acrylate, dipentaerythritol hexa(meth)acrylate, dipentaerythritol penta(meth)acrylate, dipentaerythritol tetra(meth)acrylate, caprolactone-modified dipentaerythritol hexa(meth)acrylate, caprolactone-modified dipentaerythritol penta(meth)acrylate, ditrimethylolpropane tetra(meth)acrylate, EO-modified bisphenol A

Art Unit: 1752

di(meth)acrylate, PO-modified bisphenol A di(meth)acrylate, EO-modified hydrogenated bisphenol A di(meth)acrylate, PO-modified hydrogenated bisphenol A di(meth)acrylate, EO-modified bisphenol F di(meth)acrylate, (meth)acrylate of phenol novolak polyglycidyl ether, and the like.

The above monofunctional monomers and polyfunctional monomers can be used either individually or in combinations of two or more, or in combinations of at least one monofunctional monomer and at least one polyfunctional monomer as the component (C). It is preferable that the component (C) contain 60 wt% of polyfunctional monomers having three or more ethylenically unsaturated bonds in a molecule. The proportion of these polyfunctional monomers having three or more ethylenically unsaturated bonds used in the component (C) is more preferably 70 wt% or more, even more preferably 80 wt% or more, and most preferably 100 wt%. If the proportion of these polyfunctional monomers is less than 60 wt%, the resin composition may exhibit decreased photocurability and the resulting three-dimensional objects may exhibit deformation with time. Among the commercially available polyfunctional monomers listed are compounds meeting the instant claim limitations and listed as preferred embodiments of formula 1; M-215, M-315, and M-325 manufactured by Toagosei Co. Ltd. ([0044]).

Given that the reference teaches that two or more polyfunctional monomers may be employed and the reference lists a few isocyanurate compounds by name and by product name, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to prepare the material of the reference choosing to employ one preferred compound in [0046] and one isocyanurate as a comonomer employ each in an amount meeting the instant claim limitations (45wt% of the total

Art Unit: 1752

composition, and preferably 100% of C is made up of the polyfunctional monomers, and a combination of two would be 22.5 % of each, meeting the limitations for A and C of the instant claims([0045]-[0047]).

The reference teaches and claims a process meeting the instant claim limitations.

Regarding claim 11, this claim is a product by process claim. The resultant product of the reference is a three dimensional pattern/ object and would thus meet the claim limitations. From the MPEP:

M.P.E.P. § 2113:

"Even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985)... "The Patent Office bears a lesser burden proof in making out a case of prima facie obviousness for product-by-process claims because of their peculiar nature" than when a product is claimed in the conventional fashion. In re Fessman, 180 USPQ 324, 326 (CCPA 1974). Once the Examiner provides a rationale tending to show that the claimed product appears to be the same or similar to that of the prior art, although produced by a different process, the burden shifts to applicant to come forward with evidence establishing an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art product. In re Marosi, 218 USPQ 289, 292 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Hattori et al (JP 10-104835), Ohkawa et al (EP 360869), and Takase et al (WO 03/0765280 are cited for their teachings of similar materials.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amanda C. Walke whose telephone number is 571-272-1337.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-R 5:30-4.

Art Unit: 1752

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cynthia Kelly can be reached on 571-272-1526. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Amanda C Walke
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1752

ACW
June 15, 2007